



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

The second section, "Kosmos," is exclusively and interestingly astronomical. In the third section the allegation is made and elaborated on that "number is the formative and foundation principle of the creation." While explicating the meaning of "the great 1" he attacks Darwinism, and what he calls "new-baptized Buddhism." The character of the teaching in the fourth section may be inferred from a single assertion: "A purely immaterial heaven is unknown to Scripture."

This book is the fruit of the tendency, so generally felt in philosophical and theological circles, to interpret the universe in terms of monism. In the case of our author the tendency has affected a mind of that "moralizing" sort which a century ago would have issued "Reflections" or "Meditations and Contemplations" like those of Christoph Christian Sturm or James Hervey. The result is a treatise, in a few passages suggestive and stimulating, in many whimsical as the most extravagant spiritualizations of the Kabbala; but everywhere aiming to deserve the epithet "erbaulich." Because of this commendable aim we stint our criticism and leave the work to the great distributive principle of literature, "chacun à son goût."

ROBERT KERR ECCLES.

BOWLING GREEN, O.

THE QUEST OF FAITH. Being Notes on the Current Philosophy of Religion. By THOMAS BAILEY SAUNDERS. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1899. Pp. vi + 191. \$2.50.

A TREATMENT of religious belief by an examination of representative works of the present-day discussion concerning belief in God. Chap. ii, on "Agnosticism," shows that Huxley assumed principles which refuted his scientific agnosticism. Chap. iii, on "The Sceptical Argument," examines chiefly *The Foundations of Belief* by A. J. Balfour. Chap. iv, on "A Gifford Lecturer," examines Fraser's *Philosophy of Theism*. Chap. v, on "The Teleological Argument," acceptably calls attention to the changed form in which the argument must be presented, examining the works of the Duke of Argyll, Haeckel, and Henry Drummond. Chap. vi discusses Gladstone's *Studies Subsidiary to the Works of Bishop Butler*. Chap. vii treats of representative Catholic writers, as W. S. Lilly. Chap. viii, on "The Witness of History," examines *The History of Intellectual Development* by Mr. Beattie Crozier.

This book looks like a collection of reviews and lacks somewhat in unity and progressiveness of argument. But it renders a service in

emphasizing the fact that religious faith and the philosophy of religion are of increasing interest to the mind of the present day, and that the trend of thought is away from materialism toward belief, while the changed aspects of the several arguments strengthen rather than weaken the foundations of belief.

Chaps. iii and iv are the most skilful and satisfactory ; the author shows that certitude, belief, is for Balfour "the child, not of reason, but of custom" (p. 60), and since, according to the author, the content of social custom is rational, Balfour's basis of belief is, after all, in reason. But I ask : Is not society an organization of interests rather than of thoughts, and are social customs reasoned beliefs of the past ? It is doubtful, in my opinion, whether Balfour's argument can be turned against himself in the above manner.

Again, apparently the author is, with Dr. Fraser, prepared to trust reason in the attempt to form a theory of the relations of God, man, and the world, and thus arrive at a basis for belief. Fraser would hold that the universe is rationally and morally trustworthy, which involves the postulate of a supreme moral intelligence, but the author, if I understand him, rejects Fraser's position on the ground that the attribute of omnipotence is not reconcilable with the assumption that the universe is morally trustworthy, which involves free moral agents. Is, then, reason in conflict with itself ? Nor is the final conclusion of the author an acceptable substitute for the conclusions of Dr. Fraser, namely, Crozier in the above work concludes that we are led to believe in what he calls "a stupendous and over-arching supernaturalism everywhere enfolding and pervading the world and its affairs, and giving scope and exercise to all that is properly religious." Of this Mr. Saunders says : "There is, I think, no serious difficulty in accepting this conclusion and also at the same time refusing to express adherence to any of the particular religions in which, often mixed with quite alien elements, the conclusion has been embodied" (p. 189). The question is : Which postulate, since we are to trust reason, has the more claim to the acceptance of the unbiased reason ? Everybody must decide for himself.

In conclusion I would say that this book is worthy of a careful reading by those to whom it is addressed, namely, "those who take a general interest" in the problems of religion and "are alive to the direction and importance of current controversies in the sphere of religious belief."

JAMES TEN BROEKE.

McMASTER UNIVERSITY,
Toronto, Canada.